

The China Mail.

Established February, 1846.

Vol. XXXVIII. No. 5936.

號七廿月七年二十八百八千一英

HONGKONG, THURSDAY, JULY 27, 1882.

日三十月六年午壬

PRICE, \$24 PER ANNUM.

AGENTS FOR THE CHINA MAIL.

LONDON.—F. AGAR, 11 & 12, Clement's Lane, Lombard Street, E. C. GEORGE STREET & CO., 20, Cornhill. GORDON & GORDON, Ludgate Circus, E. C. BATES HENDY & CO., 37, Wallbrook, E. C. SAMUEL DRAGON & CO., 100 & 104, Leadenhall Street.

PARIS AND EUROPE.—GALLIEN & PRINCE, 30, Rue Lafayette, Paris.

NEW YORK.—ANDREW WIND, 133, Nassau Street.

AUSTRALIA, TASMANIA, AND NEW ZEALAND.—GORDON & GORDON, Melbourne and Sydney.

SAN FRANCISCO and American Ports generally.—BRAN & BLACK, San Francisco.

SINGAPORE, STRAITS, &c.—SAYRE & CO., Square, Singapore. C. HEINZ & CO., Malacca.

CHINA.—Macao, Messrs A. A. DE MELO & CO., Senador, Camellia & Co. Any, Wilson, Nicholls & Co. Foochow, Heber & Co. Shanghai, Lane, Crawford & Co., and KELLY & WALSH, Yokohama, Lane, Crawford & Co.

Banks.

ORIENTAL BANK CORPORATION.

(Incorporated by Royal Charter.)

PAID-UP CAPITAL.....£1,500,000.

LONDON BANKERS:

BANK OF ENGLAND.

UNITED BANK OF LONDON.

BANK OF SCOTLAND, LONDON.

RATES OF INTEREST ALLOWED ON DEPOSITS.

At 3 months' notice 3 1/2 per Annum.

" 6 " " 4 " "

" 12 " " 5 " "

Current Accounts kept on Terms which may be learnt on application.

Hongkong, June 1, 1882.

HONGKONG & SHANGHAI BANKING CORPORATION.

PAID-UP CAPITAL.....5,000,000 Dollars.

RESERVE FUND.....2,100,000 Dollars.

COURT OF DIRECTORS.

Chairman—H. L. DALRYMPLE, Esq.

Deputy Chairman—Wm. REYNOLDS, Esq.

H. HOPIUS, Esq. M. E. SASSOON, Esq.

Hon. F. B. JOHNSON, Esq. C. VINCENT SMITH, Esq.

A. P. McEwen, Esq. W. S. YOUNG, Esq.

A. McIVER, Esq. F. D. SASSOON, Esq.

CHIEF MANAGER.

Hongkong, THOMAS JACKSON, Esq.

MANAGER.

Shanghai, JAMES CAMERON, Esq.

LONDON BANKERS.—London and County Bank.

HONGKONG.

INTEREST ALLOWED.

On Current Deposit Account at the rate of 2 per cent. per annum on the daily balance.

For Fixed Deposits:—

For 3 months, 3 per cent. per annum.

" 6 " " 4 per cent. " "

" 12 " " 5 per cent. " "

LOCAL BILLS DISCOUNTED.

Credits granted on approved Securities, and every description of Banking and Exchange business transacted.

Drafts, granted on London, and the chief Commercial places in Europe, India, Australia, America, China and Japan.

T. JACKSON, Chief Manager.

Offices of the Corporation,

No. 1, Queen's Road East.

Hongkong, March 22, 1882.

COMPTOIR D'ESCOMPTE DE PARIS.

(Incorporated 7th & 18th March, 1848.)

RECOGNISED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF 30th APRIL, 1862.

CAPITAL FULLY PAID-UP.....£3,200,000.

RESERVE FUND.....£800,000.

HEAD OFFICE.—11, Rue Basse, PARIS.

AGENCIES AND BRANCHES at:

LONDON, BOMBAY, SAN FRANCISCO,

MARSEILLES, BOMBAY, HONGKONG,

LYONS, CALCUTTA, HANKOW,

NANTES, SHANGHAI, FOOCHEW,

MELBOURNE, AND SYDNEY.

LONDON BANKERS:

THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

THE UNION BANK OF LONDON.

Messrs C. J. HAMBRO & SON.

The Hongkong Agency receives Fixed Deposits on Terms to be ascertained on application; grants Drafts and Credits on all parts of the World, and transacts every description of Banking Exchange Business.

F. COCHINARD, Agent, Hongkong.

Hongkong, February 8, 1882.

MANCHESTER FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY OF MANCHESTER AND LONDON.

ESTABLISHED 1824.

Capital of the Company £1,000,000 Sterling of which is paid up £2,100,000

Reserve Fund and Profit £1,200,000

Annual Income £200,000

THE Undersigned have been appointed Agents for the above Company at Hongkong, Canton, Foochow, Shanghai, and all parts of the World, and transact every description of Insurance at current rates.

HOLLIDAY, WISE & Co.

Hongkong, October 15, 1882.

Notices of Firms.

NOTICE.

THE INTEREST AND RESPONSIBILITY OF MR. CHARLES KAHN in our Firm CHASED on the 30th April, 1882.

REISS & Co.

Hongkong, 1st May, 1882.

Auctions.

POSTPONEMENT.

PUBLIC AUCTION.

THE Undersigned has received instructions to Sell by Public Auction, on **SATURDAY,**

the 29th July, 1882, at Noon, at his Sales Rooms, Queen's Road,—

(Under Bill of Sale),

THE BALANCE OF THE STOCK-IN-TRADE

of Messrs NOOR MAHOMED KHAMIS & Co.

TERMS OF SALE.—As customary.

J. M. ARMSTRONG, Auctioneer.

Hongkong, July 25, 1882.

POSTPONEMENT.

PUBLIC AUCTION.

THE following PROPERTIES will be SOLD by the Undersigned by Public Auction, on **SATURDAY,**

the 29th July, 1882, at 3 p.m., on the Premises,—

(In Six SEPARATE LOTS.)

1st Lot.—One HOUSE in QUEEN'S ROAD CENTRAL, No. 147b, Registered as the REMAINING PORTION OF SECTION 9 of MARINE LOT No. 63.

2nd Lot.—One HOUSE in BONHAM STRAND, No. 117, Registered as SECTION A of MARINE LOT No. 161.

3rd Lot.—One HOUSE in QUEEN'S ROAD WEST, No. 50, Registered as SUBSECTION No. 1, of SECTION A of INLAND LOT No. 161.

4th Lot.—One HOUSE in WEST STREET, Tai-ping-shan, No. 41, Registered as INLAND LOT 223, (Section.)

5th Lot.—One HOUSE in NEW WEST STREET, Tai-ping-shan, No. 63, Lot 224, (Section.)

6th Lot.—Three HOUSES in SQUARE STREET, Tai-ping-shan, Nos. 58, 60 & 62, Registered as INLAND LOT No. 278.

For further Particulars and Conditions of Sale, apply to

J. M. GUEDES, Auctioneer.

Hongkong, July 24, 1882.

PUBLIC AUCTION

OR

VERY HANDSOME AND VALUABLE

ENGLISH, AMERICAN AND

SHANGHAI-MADE HOUSEHOLD

FURNITURE, MIRRORS,

PAINTINGS, &c., &c.

THE Undersigned has received instructions to Sell by Public Auction, on **FRIDAY,**

the 4th August, 1882, at 2 p.m., at No. 2, GAGE STREET,—

The whole of the

VERY HANDSOME AND VALUABLE

HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE, &c.,

comprising:—

Silk and Wool Covered DRAWING-ROOM SUITE; COTTAGE PIANO, by SCHWABER; VERY HANDSOME BRUSSELS CARPETS, quite new; LARGE GILT MARBLE MIRRORS, BOMBAY CARVED WHATNOT, MARBLE-TOP TABLE, ENGLISH-MADE CHIPPENDALE PLATE-GLASS BACK and DOORS, WATER COLOURS, OIL PAINTINGS, CHROMOS, ENGRAVINGS.

SATSUMA and YEDDO VASES, STATUETTES, ORNAMENTS, CRYSTAL and BRONZE GLAZED, &c., &c.

MARBLE-TOP TRAP SIDEBOARD, PLATE-GLASS BACK SOLID MAROQUIN EXTENSION DINING TABLE, CHAIRS, PINK and GOLD EMBROIDERED DINNER SET, complete; TURQUOISE and GOLD DESERT SET, GLASS and PLATED WARE, CUTLERY, &c., &c.

VERY HANDSOME BEDROOM SUITE, quite new, made by MESSRS HALL & HOLZ, Shanghai, comprising: VALNET and MARBLE EMBROIDERED BEDSTEAD, with SPRING MATTRESS, &c., CHEST of DRAWERS, DRESSING TABLE, with MIRROR and WARDROBE to MATCH; AMERICAN SOLID MAROQUIN BEDSTEAD, AMERICAN WALNUT INLAIN MARBLE-TOP WASHING STAND and DRESSING TABLE; WARDROBE, with PLATE-GLASS DOORS; SILK and WOOL COVERED COUCH and EASY CHAIRS, HANDSOME LACE CURTAINS, BRASS POLES, DOUBLE WASHING SET, SHANGHAI BATE, LADY'S EVENING CHAIRS, AMERICAN COOKING STOVE, &c., &c., &c.

Catalogues will be issued previous to the Sale, and the Articles will be on view on Thursday, the 3rd August.

TERMS OF SALE.—As customary.

G. R. LAMBERT, Auctioneer.

Hongkong, July 25, 1882.

For Sale.

FOR PRIVATE SALE.

BLUE BUILDINGS BLOCK.

MARINE LOT No. 65, containing 4

Large GRANITE GODOWNS in the PRAYA EAST, and 17 CHINESE HOUSES in

QUEEN'S ROAD EAST. The above Property will be Sold in One Lot or in 4 separate

Lots of One House and 1 Godown in a Lot, and the 17 HOUSES in another Lot.

For Price and Particulars, apply to

LEONG LUEN FO, or to

J. M. GUEDES, Auctioneer.

Hongkong, July 19, 1882.

WASHING BOOKS.

(In English and Chinese.)

WASHBURN'S BOOKS, for the use of Ladies and Gentlemen, can now be had at this Office. Price, \$1 each.

CHINA MAIL OFFICE.

For Sale.

LANE, CRAWFORD & Co.

HAVE Received for their NEW FURNISHING DEPARTMENT, A FULL STOCK OF HOUSEHOLD LINEN, &c., comprising:—

COTTON and LINEN SHEETING.

PILLOW LINEN.

TABLE CLOTHS and DAMASK.

TABLE COVERS.

COTTON and UNION TICKING.

BED QUILTS.

NAPKINS.

TOILET COVERS.

GLASS CLOTH.

TOWELS and TOWELLING OF ALL DESCRIPTIONS.

ESTIMATES GIVEN, for FURNITURE, BED and TABLE LINEN, CURTAINS and WINDOW HANGINGS, CARPETS, CROCKERY, GLASSWARE, ELECTRO WARE, &c., &c., &c.

Hongkong, July 18, 1882.

For Sale.

FOR SALE.

FIVE THOUSAND GALLONS AVERILL and PIONEER AMERICAN MIXED PAINTS. The following Colors:—FRENCH GRAY, STONE, LIGHT STONE, WAGON RED, DARK GREEN, CHROME YELLOW, FIRE PROOF, MARINE BLUE, DARK RED, INSIDE WHITE and OUTSIDE WHITE.

Also,

20 Cases AMERICAN AXLE GREASE.

To be Sold less than San Francisco Prices.

In Quantities to Suit Purchasers.

Apply to

AMERICAN NOVELTY COMPANY.

S. B. LEWIS, Manager.

Hongkong, July 26, 1882.

FOR SALE.

A. RAUTER MAINZ DELICIOUS TABLE BEER.

4 doz & Case CHAMPAGNE BOTTLES.

\$11. Apply to

SANDER & Co.

Hongkong, March 30, 1882.

FOR SALE.

JULES MUMM & Co.'s CHAMPAGNE.

Quarts.....\$17 per doz. Case.

Pints.....\$18 per doz. Case.

GIBB, LIVINGSTON & Co.

Hongkong, November 1, 1881.

FOR SALE.

THE CELEBRATED CARLTON WHISKY.

11 YEARS OLD.

\$14. Case of 1 doz.

SIEMSEN & Co.

Hongkong, July 22, 1882.

FOR SALE.

B. & E. PERRIER'S CHAMPAGNE.

Pints.....\$18 per doz. Case.

3 Pints.....\$19 per doz. Case.

GILMAN & Co.

Hongkong, June 23, 1882.

FOR SALE.

ABOUT 2,000 lbs. MILLER & RICHARD'S Extra-hard Metal BOURGEOIS TYPE, No. 19, (somewhat worn but in fairly good condition).

Apply to

OFFICE OF THIS PAPER.

To Let.

TO LET.

APARTMENTS on the FIRST FLOOR of "MARINE HOUSE," West Side, and in No. 33, POTTINGER STREET.

Apply to

E. R. BELLIOS.

Hongkong, July 20, 1882.

TO LET.

NO. 9, SEYMOUR TERRACE, Nos. 2 and 4, PEDDAR'S HILL, No. 4, OLD BAILEY STREET.

No. 6, QUEEN'S ROAD CENTRAL (lately occupied by PACIFIC MAIL S. S. Co.).

Apply to

DAVID SASSOON, SONS & Co.

Hongkong, July 24, 1882.

GODOWNS-TO LET.

PRAYA EAST AND WANCHAI ROAD.

For Particulars, apply to

SIEMSEN & Co.

Hongkong, April 26, 1882.

TO LET.

(WITH IMMEDIATE POSSESSION.)

THE NEW FAMILY RESIDENCE situated next to EXCELSIOR on Robinson Road, replete with every convenience, TENNIS LAWN, STABLES, &c.

Also,

8 FIRST-CLASS GODOWNS of all Sizes—Water-side. Inspection is invited.

Apply to

SHARP, TOLLER & JOHNSON.

Hongkong, June 16, 1882.

Intimations.

THE HONGKONG HOTEL COMPANY, LIMITED.

NOTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS.

THE Ordinary Half-Yearly MEETING of SHAREHOLDERS will be held at the HONGKONG HOTEL on FRIDAY, the 28th Instant, at 4 o'clock in the Afternoon, for the purpose of receiving a Report of the Directors, together with a Statement of Accounts and declaring a Dividend.

By Order of the Board of Directors,

LOUIS HAUSCHILD, Secretary.

Hongkong, July 7, 1882.

HONGKONG HOTEL COMPANY, LIMITED.

THE Transfer BOOKS of the Company will be CLOSED from the 14th to the 28th Instant, both days inclusive.

By Order of the Board of Directors,

LOUIS HAUSCHILD, Secretary.

Hongkong, July 7, 1882.

HONGKONG, CANTON, AND MACAO STEAMBOAT COMPANY, LIMITED.

NOTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS.

THE Thirty-Second Ordinary Half-Yearly MEETING of SHAREHOLDERS of the Company will be held at the Office of the Company, No. 52, Queen's Road, on MONDAY, the 31st July instant, at 3 o'clock in the Afternoon, for the purpose of receiving a Report of the Directors, together with a Statement of Accounts and declaring a Dividend, and electing Directors and Auditors.

By Order of the Board of Directors,

P. A. DA COSTA, Secretary.

Hongkong, July 11, 1882.

HONGKONG, CANTON, AND MACAO STEAMBOAT COMPANY, LIMITED.

NOTICE.

THE Transfer BOOKS of the Company will be CLOSED from the 18th to the 31st Instant, both days inclusive.

By Order of the Board of Directors,

P. A. DA COSTA, Secretary.

Hongkong, July 11, 1882.

CHINA TRADERS' INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.

NOTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS.

THE Sixteenth Ordinary MEETING of SHAREHOLDERS in the above Company will be held at the Head Office, Victoria, Hongkong, on MONDAY, the 31st Instant, at 3.30 o'clock p.m., for the purpose of receiving the Report of the Directors and Statement of Accounts to 30th April last, and of declaring Dividends.

The Transfer BOOKS of the Company will be CLOSED from the 18th to 31st Instant, both days inclusive.

By Order,

For Sale.

MacEWEEN, FRICKEL & Co.
No. 53, Queen's Road East,
(OPPOSITE THE COMMISSIONARY'S)
RE NOW LANDING, EX
BRITISH BARQUE
"STILLWATER."

**DEVOS'S NONPAREIL
BRILLIANT
KEROSINE OIL,**
150° test.

**SPARTAN COOKING
STOVES.**

FAIRBANKS SCALES.
OAKUM.
TAR.

EX "AMERICAN MAIL."

**CALIFORNIA
RACKER**

COMPANY'S BISCUITS in 5 lb
tins, and loose.

Alphabetical BIS-
CUITS.

Pancake Sweet Mince
BISCUITS.

Ginger CAKES.

Soda BISCUITS.

Oyster BISCUITS.

Cracked WHEAT.

OATMEAL.

HOMINY.

CORNMEAL.

TOPOCAN BUTTER.

Eastern and Californian CHEESE.

Boiled CODFISH.

Prime HAMS and BACON.

Eagle Brand Condensed MILK.

PEACH and APPLE BUTTER.

Pickled OX-TONGUES.

Family PIG-PORK in kegs and pieces.

Fernon MACKEREL in 5 lb cans.

Best Ideal SALMON in 5 lb cans.

Cutting's Dessert FRUITS in 24 lb cans.

" Assorted Canned VEGETABLES.

" Potted SAUSAGE and Sausage

MEAT.

" Stuffed PEPPERS.

" Assorted PICKLES.

" MINCEMEAT.

COMB HONEY in Original Frames.

Richardson & Robbins's Celebrated Potted

MEATS.

Richardson & Robbins's Curried OYSTERS.

" Lunch TONGUE.

McCarthy's Sugar LEMONADE.

Olson CHOWDER.

Smoked SALMON.

Green TURTLE in 24 lb cans.

" &c., &c., &c.

A LARGE ASSORTMENT OF STORES,

including:

TEYSSONNEAU'S DESSERT FRUITS.

ALMONDS and RAISINS.

PIONIC TONGUES.

COCOATINA.

VAN HOUTEN'S COCOA.

LIEBIG'S & EY'S COCOA.

FRENCH PLUMS.

PATE DE FOIE GRAS.

MINCKMEAT.

SAUSAGES.

BROWN.

ISIGNY BUTTER.

DANISH BUTTER.

BREAKFAST TONGUES.

ANCHOVIES.

ASPARAGUS.

SOUPS, &c.

WINE and SPIRITS.

CHAMPAGNES—

HEIDENREICH'S MONOPOLE & WHITE

SEAL.

VEUVE OLIVIER PONSARDIN.

JULES MUMM & Co., pints & quarts.

CLARETS—

CHATEAU MARGAUX.

CHATEAU LA ROSSE, pints & quarts.

CHATEAU LAITIE, " "

CHATEAU LAITIE, " "

BREAKFAST CLARET, " "

CLARETS—

SACCOE'S MANZANILLA & AMON-

TILLADO.

SACCOE'S OLD INVALID PORT

(1848).

HUNT'S PORT.

BRANDY, WHISKY, LIQUEURS, &c.—

1 and 3-star HENNESSY'S BRANDY.

Blaque Dubouché & Co.'s BRANDY.

Finest OLD BOURBON WHISKY.

KINABAL'S LI WHISKY.

ROYAL GLENDEE WHISKY.

CHATEAU HENNESSY.

MARSHBURN.

OURACAO.

ANGOSTURA, BAKER'S and ORANGE

BITTERS.

" &c., &c., &c.

BASS'S ALE, bottled by CAMERON and

SAUNDERS, pints and quarts.

GUINNESS'S STOUT, bottled by E. &

J. BUCKLEY, pints and quarts.

PILSENER BEER, in quarts.

DRAUGHT ALE and PORTER, by the

Gallon.

ALE and PORTER, in hogsheads.

SPECIAL SELECTED

CIGARS.

Fine New Season's GUMSHAW TEA, in

5 and 10 catty boxes.

BREAKFAST CONGOU @ 25 cents p. lb.

SEASIDE LIBRARY, 15 to 25 cents.

FRANKLIN SQUARE LIBRARY, 15 to

25 cents.

MILNER'S PATENT FIRE-PROOF

SAVES, and CASH BOXES, at

Manufacturer's Prices.

Hongkong, June 1, 1882.

Mails.

Occidental & Oriental Steam-Ship Company.

TAKING CARGO AND PASSENGERS
TO JAPAN, THE UNITED

STATES, MEXICO, CENTRAL AND
SOUTH AMERICA, AND EUROPE.

VIA
THE OVERLAND RAILWAYS,

AND
ATLANTIC & OTHER CONNECTING
STEAMERS.

THE S. S. COPTIC will be despatched
for San Francisco via Yokohama,
on SATURDAY, the 29th July, 1882, at
Noon.

Connection being made at Yokohama
with Steamers from Shanghai and Japan
ports.

All Parcel Packages should be marked to
address in full; and same will be received
at the Company's Office, until 5 p.m. the
day previous to sailing.

A Reduction of 25 % made on all
RETURN PASSAGE ORDERS ISSUED.

Consular Invoices to accompany Over-
land, Mexican, Central and South American
Cargo, should be sent to the Company's
Office, addressed to the Collector of
Customs, San Francisco.

For further information as to Freight
or Passage, apply to the Agency of the
Company, No. 50A, Queen's Road Central,
Hongkong.

P. E. FOSTER,
Agent.

Hongkong, July 15, 1882. jy29

MITSU BISHI MAIL STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

STEAM FOR
SINGAPORE, PENANG,
COLOMBO, ADEN, SUEZ, PORT SAID,
MALTA, GIBRALTAR, BRINDISI,
ANCONA, VENICE, PLYMOUTH,
AND LONDON.

ALSO,
BOMBAY, MADRAS, CALCUTTA, AND
AUSTRALIA.

N. B.—Cargo can be taken on through Bills
of Lading for BATAVIA, PERSIAN
GULF PORTS, MARSEILLES,
TRIESTE, HAMBURG, NEW YORK
AND BOSTON.

THE PENINSULAR AND ORIENTAL STEAM
NAVIGATION COMPANY'S Steamship
ROSETTA, Captain BARLOW, with
Her Majesty's Mail, will be despatched
from this for LONDON direct, via SUEZ
CANAL, and usual Ports of Call, on
FRIDAY, the 4th August, at Daylight.

Cargo will be received on board until
Noon on the day previous.

Parcels and Specie (Gold) at the Office
until Noon on the day previous.

For further Particulars, regarding
FREIGHT and PASSAGE, apply to the
PENINSULAR & ORIENTAL STEAM NAVI-
GATION COMPANY'S Office, Hongkong.

The Contents and Value of Packages are
required to be declared prior to shipment.

Shippers are particularly requested to
note the terms and conditions of the Com-
pany's Black Bills of Lading.

For this Vessel will call at Colombo.

A. McIVER, Superintendent.

Hongkong, July 21, 1882. and

THE CHINA MAIL STEAMSHIP

COMPANY.

STEAM TO NAGASAKI AND KOBE,
VIA INLAND SEA.

(Taking Cargo and Passengers for YOKO-
HAMA and VLADIVOSTOK.)

THE S. S. SUMIDA MARU, Captain
HAYASHI, will leave on or about the
30th instant, will be despatched as above
on FRIDAY, the 4th August, at 4 p.m.

Cargo received on board and parcels at
the Office up to 1 p.m. of day of sailing.

No Bill of Lading signed under \$2
Freight.

All Claims must be settled on board
before delivery is taken, otherwise they
will not be recognized.

Cargo and Passengers for Yokohama
will be transhipped to the Shanghai Mail
Steamer at Kobe, and for Vladivostok at
Nagasaki.

For further Particulars, apply at the
Company's Office, Praya Central, Ground
Floor of Messrs HESS & Co.

H. J. H. TRIPP,
Agent.

Hongkong, July 24, 1882. and

U. S. MAIL LINE.

PACIFIC MAIL STEAMSHIP
COMPANY.

THROUGH TO NEW YORK, VIA
OVERLAND RAILWAYS, AND TOUCHING
AT YOKOHAMA, AND SAN FRANCISCO.

THE U. S. Mail Steamship CITY OF
SACRAMENTO will be despatched for San
Francisco via Yokohama, on SATURDAY,
the 19th August, 1882, at Noon, taking
Passengers, and Freight, for Japan, the
United States, and Europe.

Through Bills of Lading issued for trans-
portation to Yokohama and other Japan
Ports, to San Francisco, to Atlantic and
Inland Cities of the United States, via Over-
land Railways, to Havina, Trinidad, Central
and South America, by the Company's and
connecting Steamers.

Through Passage Tickets granted to
England, France, and Germany by all
trans-Atlantic lines of Steamers.

On prepaid RETURN PASSAGE Tickets a
Reduction of 25 % is made.

Freight will be received on board until 4
p.m. on the 11th August. Parcel Packages
will be received at the office until 5 p.m.,
same day; all Parcel Packages should be
marked to address in full; value of same
is required.

Consular Invoices to accompany Overland
Cargo should be sent to the Company's
Office in Sealed Envelopes, addressed to the
Collector of Customs at San Francisco.

For further information as to Passage
and Freight, apply to the Agency of the
Company, No. 50A, Queen's Road Central.

F. E. FOSTER,
Agent.

Hongkong, July 15, 1882. and

Insurances.

THE CITY OF LONDON FIRE IN-
SURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED.

CAPITAL, £2,000,000. PAID-UP, £200,000.
PAID-UP RESERVE FUND, £250,000.

THE Undersigned having been appointed
Agents for the above Company are
prepared to ACCEPT RISKS against
FIRE at Current Rates.

GEO. R. STEVENS & Co.
Hongkong, January 1, 1882.

NORTH BRITISH & MERCANTILE
INSURANCE COMPANY.

THE Undersigned, Agents of the above
Company, are authorized to insure
against FIRE at Current Rates.

GILMAN & Co.
Hongkong, January 1, 1882.

THE TOKIO MARINE INSURANCE
COMPANY, LIMITED.

THE Undersigned, Agents for the above
Company, are authorized to insure
against FIRE at Current Rates.

H. J. H. TRIPP,
Agent, M. B. M. S. S. Co.
Hongkong, April 26, 1882. oc27

THE SOUTH BRITISH FIRE AND
MARINE INSURANCE COMPANY
OF NEW ZEALAND.

CAPITAL £1,000,000 (One Million Sterling).

Undertaken Liability of Shareholders.

THE Undersigned having been appointed
Agents for the above Company are
prepared to accept FIRE and MARINE
RISKS at Current Rates, allowing usual
Discounts.

GEO. R. STEVENS & Co.
Hongkong, July 1, 1881.

Intimations.

NEWS FOR HOME.

The Overland China Mail.

(The oldest Overland Route in China.)

PUBLISHED AT THE "CHINA MAIL" OFFICE
IN TIME FOR THE ENGLISH MAIL.

Containing from 72 to 84 columns of closely-
printed matter.

THIS Mail Summary is compiled from
the Daily China Mail, is published
once a month on the morning of the
English Mail's departure, and is a
record of each fortnight's current history
of events in China and Japan, con-
tributed in original reports and collected
from the journals published at the various
ports in those countries.

It contains Shipping news from Shanghai,
Hongkong, Canton, &c., and a complete
Commercial Summary.

Subscription, 50 cents per Copy (postage
paid 5 cents). \$12 per annum (postage
paid \$12.50).

Orders should be sent to GEO. MURRAY
BAIRD, China Mail Office, 2, Wyndham
Street, not later than noon of the day the
English Mail leaves.

Terms of Advertising, same as in Daily
China Mail.

SAILORS' HOME.

ANY Cast-off CLOTHING, BOOKS, &c.,
or PAPERS will be thankfully received
at the Sailors' Home, Water Street.
Hongkong, July 25, 1878.

To-day's Advertisements.

FROM HAMBURG, ANTWERP,
SINGAPORE AND MANILA.

THE Steamship Wandah, Captain
SPELDT, having arrived from the
above Ports, consignees of Cargo are hereby
informed that the Goods are being landed
and stored at their risk into the Godowns
of the Undersigned, whence and/or from
the Wharves or Boats delivery may be obtained.

Optional Cargo will be forwarded un-
der notice to the contrary being given before
10 a.m. To-morrow, the 28th instant.

Cargo remaining on board after the
4th August will be subject to rent.

No Fire Insurance has been effected.

Bills of Lading will be countersigned by
MELOHERS & Co.,
Agents.

Hongkong, July 27, 1882. jy30

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF
HONGKONG.

IN BANKRUPTCY.

NOTICE.—NOR MAHOMED KHAMISA
and ALY MAHOMED KHAMISA, trad-
ing together at Nos. 8 and 10, Peel Street,
Victoria, Hongkong, as DRAPERS, and the
pseudonym of "NOR MAHOMED KHAMISA,"
having been adjudged BANKRUPT under a Peti-
tion for adjudication filed in the Supreme
Court of Hongkong, in Bankruptcy, on the
18th day of July, 1882, are hereby required
to surrender themselves to EDWARD JAMES
ACKROYD, Esquire, the Registrar of the said
Court, at the First MEETING of CREDITORS
to be held by the said Registrar on
THURSDAY, the 3rd day of August, 1882,
at 11 o'clock in the Forenoon, precisely, at
his Chambers, Supreme Court.

The said EDWARD JAMES ACKROYD,
Esquire, is the Official Assignee, and Messrs
DENNIS and MOSSOP are the Solicitors in
the Bankruptcy.

A Public Sitting will hereafter be ap-
pointed by the said Court for the said
Bankrupts to pass their Final Examination
and to make application for their Discharge,
of which Sitting notice will be given in the
Hongkong Government Gazette.

At the First Meeting of Creditors, the
Registrar will receive the Proof of the
Debts of the Creditors, and the Creditors
who shall have proved their Debts, respec-
tively, on the majority in value of the said
Creditors, are hereby directed to choose at
such Meeting an assignee or assignees of the
Bankrupts' Estate and Effects to be called
the Creditors' Assignee or Assignees.

Dated this 22nd day of July, 1882.

DENNIS & MOSSOP,
Solicitors in the Matter.

TO LET.

THREE HOUSES in RICHMOND
Terrace, Bonham Road. Rent
Moderate.

Apply to
HONGKONG DISPENSARY,
Hongkong, July 7, 1882.

To-day's Advertisements.

NETHERLANDS INDIA STEAM
NAVIGATION COMPANY, LIMITED.

FOR BATAVIA, SAMARANG AND
SOURABAYA, VIA PONTIANAK.

The Steamship
"William Mackinnon,"
Captain ORVILLE, will be
despatched for the above
Ports TO-MORROW, the 28th instant, at
4 p.m.

For Freight or Passage, apply to
JARDINE, MATHESON & Co.,
Agents.

Hongkong, July 27, 1882. jy28

FOR SWATOW, AMOY AND
TAIWANFOO.

The Steamship
"Captain GORDON," will be
despatched for the above
Ports on SUNDAY, the 30

2. That I honestly believed, when the article headed "The Hon. Mr. O'Brien," that it was a fair and legitimate piece of satirical criticism on the sketch of Mr. Bandmann's life in *Men of the Time*, which had been published in the local papers a few weeks previously, and that I had not the slightest reason to believe that anything, however contemptible could possibly be constructed by the inference upon Mr. Bandmann's private character.

3. That the imputations in the paragraph of June 14th were fairly made in the belief that their truth would remain undisputed, and I honestly believed that I was in law privileged to defend myself in the manner adopted from the gratuitous, slanderous, and insulting attacks of the prosecutor.

That after the case was committed for trial by the Magistrate, the prosecutor continued almost daily in various places in this Colony using insulting and opprobrious terms towards myself and my newspaper, doing everything in his power to injure me with the public, and preventing me from taking any steps to publicly apologise.

5. That I express my sincere regret for having violated the law, and unjustly and illegally aspersed the character of the prosecutor, and respectfully submit myself to the merciful consideration of the Court.

Mr. Francis, in his closing speech, said that he had no affidavit of aggravation, but he would ask his Lordship's permission to put in the *Hongkong Telegraph* of the 19th and 20th July, containing a report of that trial, and would call his Lordship's attention to what he was afraid, would be considered as a serious matter. Mr. Francis said that in publishing a report of this trial had absolutely omitted to print or publish one single syllable of the evidence given by Mr. Bandmann or by any of the witnesses called on his behalf, and had not even mentioned the fact in his report of the trial of his having been necessary for him to add any remark with reference to that fact. He would also ask his Lordship's permission to put in the paper of 21st July containing an article by Mr. Fraser-Smith. In connection with it, he would call his Lordship's attention to these few lines:—"As a matter of law the case by the jury of the defendant to the merciful consideration of the Court, on the grounds that he had received provocation, and had published the articles believing them in substance to be true, was a moral victory for the defendant."

His Lordship to defendant: Do you wish to say anything?

Mr. Fraser-Smith said he could only say that he could not comprehend the object of the learned counsel in referring to the report of the evidence in the trial which appeared in the *Hongkong Telegraph*. Had he received notice that those papers were to be put in, he should have taken steps to offer some explanation. He (Mr. Smith) did not comprehend the object of the references.

His Lordship said he (Mr. Smith) purported to give a report of what took place in that Court. He had put in all the evidence that was given by the various witnesses on his own behalf regarding Mr. Bandmann's treatment of him, but he had put in none of the evidence of Mr. Bandmann or of anybody called on his behalf.

Mr. Fraser-Smith said it was the first time he had heard of it, he was not aware of it before.

His Lordship said if it had been done purposely it was a very serious thing, and he (Mr. Smith) would make it appear to the world that he had brought evidence against Mr. Bandmann's character, which Mr. Bandmann had made no reply whatever.

Mr. Fraser-Smith said that the *Hongkong Telegraph* being published at four in the afternoon the reports were necessarily condensed, in fact the eloquent address of the learned counsel was disposed of in two or three lines. They were not in the habit of publishing state news, and if the evidence given by Mr. Bandmann was not in the *Telegraph*, it was stale.

His Lordship pointed out that the evidence of Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Inman, Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Ogden had been given in full. Mr. Bandmann was examined to that evidence. He called Miss Beaudet, and one or two other witnesses, but there was no notice of them in his (Mr. Smith's) paper.

Mr. Fraser-Smith said that having been in attendance at Court during the trial he had been unable to look after the newspaper himself.

His Lordship: You say it was entirely inadvertently omitted?

Mr. Fraser-Smith said he could assure his Lordship it was. He was not aware until that moment that the evidence had not appeared.

Mr. Francis said that, in addressing his Lordship on the subject, he did not propose to say anything with reference to the plea of justification which had been filed in connection with the case, or the evidence called to support it, or the proceedings during the trial, as they must be thoroughly before his Lordship's mind. There was not the least necessity to call his Lordship's attention to the fact that in cases of law the plea of justification answered in to the very last moment, and emphasized in Mr. Fraser-Smith's final address to the jury, was a matter of aggravation. With reference to the report published on the 19th and 20th of July, he would call his Lordship's attention to the fact that the report terminated in this way: "After giving the whole of the evidence of the 19th, he had given the whole evidence of Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Inman, Mr. Schmidt, Mr. Ogden, Mr. James Parker, of Mr. James Hodge, and mentioned the fact that Mr. George Murray Bain was put in the witness box, but that no evidence was given by him—he then went on to report that Mr. Bandmann had been on his trial just as much as Mr. Fraser-Smith. He came there to vindicate his character, and the jury had done that to a considerable extent, but persons looking into a libel case such as this would look only to see what was the verdict of the jury, and not what was the opinion of the press, and what was the opinion of the public, and what was the opinion of the Court." He asked his Lordship to mark clearly in the sentence he would pronounce his sense of the want of unadvised and malicious nature of the libel published by Mr. Fraser-Smith, of the character of his conduct subsequent to these libels, and of the complete failure of any proof given in that Court to sustain any title of the charges that Mr. Fraser-Smith deliberately made and repeated not once but several times with reference to Mr. Bandmann. "It was only with a view to Mr. Bandmann's character, to his future vindication, that he asked that his Lordship should mark his

sense of such proceedings by an adequate sentence, that Mr. Bandmann might hereafter be able to say that not only was Mr. Fraser-Smith found guilty by the verdict of the jury, but that his Lordship concurred in that verdict to the fullest extent, and that his Lordship made known by his sentence that the offence was very grave and indeed, and that Mr. Fraser-Smith had failed to justify any one of his charges against Mr. Bandmann. With reference to the recommendation of the jury, if it had been more a recommendation, it might have had some weight with his Lordship, but with the reasons given in support of it, he (Mr. Francis) would humbly say his Lordship could not concur, and he might ask it to be left out of consideration. They had had strong enough evidence to justify them in charging Mr. Fraser-Smith with publishing slanderous and malicious statements knowing them to be false, or at least not knowing them to be true, and either knowing or caring whether they were true or false, or making any inquiry into their truth. He would ask his Lordship to pass such a sentence as would enable all the world to understand that not one of the slanderous imputations against Mr. Bandmann had, in the opinion of his Lordship, been sustained by a title of evidence.

His Lordship, addressing the defendant, said that after long and patient trial (Mr. Smith) had been found guilty unanimously by the jury on the second count, and by six to one on the first count, and the jury further recommended him to the merciful consideration of the Court, as they considered he had received provocation, and that he published these libels believing them in substance to be true. He (Mr. Smith) had filed an affidavit in which to some extent he asked for mitigation of punishment upon the same grounds as recommended by the jury. In that he said that the articles published in the *Telegraph* and found by the jury to be libels were honestly published, and solely to protect himself from the insulting attacks made upon him by the prosecutor. His Lordship read the paragraph of the affidavit in which defendant denied that he intended to injure Mr. Bandmann's character. In the fifth paragraph his Lordship said defendant had very properly expressed his sincere regret for having violated the law and unjustly and illegally aspersed the character of the prosecutor, and submitted himself to the merciful consideration of the Court. His Lordship said he had to consider the sentence he should pass upon him—a sentence which should not be too severe, but at the same time a sentence which should prevent the recurrence of such a thing not only in his (Mr. Smith's) paper but in any other. Of course the nature of the offence with which he had been charged had to be taken into consideration. With regard to the statement that he had published the articles believing them to be true, which the jury found to be false, he (Mr. Smith) must be aware that there were three classes of libel in the Act, 6 and 7 of Victoria. The first was for publishing or threatening to publish a libel for the purpose of extorting money. That was punishable with three years imprisonment with or without hard labour, or secondly, for malicious or defamatory libel, knowing the same to be false; that was punishable with any term not exceeding two years, and such fine as the Court might award. The third was for maliciously publishing any defamatory libel, the punishment for which was fine or imprisonment, or both as the Court might think fit. In this case it was the third offence which was charged. Had he been charged with the second the jury could have found him guilty of simply publishing a defamatory libel; that was what he was charged with, and the recommendation of the jury only went to that extent, although he was charged with intent, although he was charged with intent knowing it to be false, though the evidence might have gone to show that he (Mr. Smith) knew it to be true. They had recommended him to the mercy of the Court on the ground of great provocation. His Lordship said that he was unable to give any great provocation, but that certain remarks about him before the publication of the article in question, and had sent him an insulting message. But that was no justification for publishing a libel, as Mr. Smith had admitted in his paper. Provocation was no excuse when a man was indicted for maliciously publishing a libel, it was no defence for a man who was charged with the crime of murder to say he was provoked into committing the crime; and not only was it no defence, but it was not taken into account in consideration of mitigation of punishment. No man had a right to take the law into his own hands; and he (Mr. Smith) had no right to publish these articles to retaliate upon Mr. Bandmann or to defend himself. With regard to the first article, entitled "Tragic Power," it would appear from the evidence given at the trial that he (Mr. Smith) sought for that article—he had had an original copy in his possession but he had lost it, and the presumption which his Lordship imagined the jury drew was that he was annoyed with Mr. Bandmann—Mr. (Mr. Smith) said that he was unaware that press privileges had been withdrawn, and that the advertisements had ceased, but he had never been stopped—annoyed at some remarks which he came to his own, and therefore published the article. It was quite true that if it had been nothing more than a criticism on the sketch in *Men of the Time* he might have been justified in publishing it, provided he did not do it for the purpose of annoying Mr. Bandmann. When they came to take into consideration the nature of the article, it appeared that the article was a satire, and he had no point, but when they came to the article charging Mr. Bandmann with being a woman beater, and the other terms, they were quite justified in looking at it as one of a series of articles holding up Mr. Bandmann to the world as a man whose in the habit of beating women. With regard to the other article, he (Mr. Smith) raised his defence on a case which his Lordship thought had no application whatever to the present circumstances. If when he was first taken before the Police Magistrate, and after Mr. Bandmann's denial of having been convicted of assaulting Mr. O'Brien, he (Mr. Smith) had published an apology, he would have stood in a much better position than he did now. He had said he did not do this because Mr. Bandmann was abusing him; that ought to have had no effect with him whatever in the performance of his duty. If he had reflected justly on Mr. Bandmann he certainly ought to have sought for some evidence of that, however, he had defended himself before the Police Magistrate, and put in a plea of justification in that Court, and went into his defence. He had admitted that he had been unable to prove the more serious charges, but he had called witnesses belonging to Mr. Bandmann's troops to show that Mr. Bandmann was not a confirmed woman beater, he did use bad language to the ladies of his company. That was no defence or justification. Besides, he (Mr. Smith) had repeated his assertions in his address to the jury, not only with regard to that, but also with regard to the "Mrs. Bandmann" case, and he had said that his Lordship should mark his

that it was not until after conviction that he believed himself wrong. He might have been actuated by mistaken motives throughout, and his Lordship believed, as he could judge of his (Mr. Smith's) character that he really believed he was just. In advancing the defence he did, but at the same time he was aware that he took into consideration in passing sentence 6 and 7 of Victoria, which provided that where justification was pleaded it had to be considered whether or not the evidence was an aggravation. In his Lordship's opinion in this case it was an aggravation, he was willing to believe that the evidence given on Mr. Bandmann's behalf was inadvertently left out of the paper, and would not take it into consideration in passing sentence; but this was a case in which his Lordship felt that the sentence which was passed could not be a light one. He had to consider, and although he did not press for a heavy sentence yet, he (Mr. Bandmann) asked through his counsel for such a sentence as would mark the gravity of the offence which he (Mr. Smith) had committed, and he (Mr. Bandmann) asked that the effect of a trial in the Court should be to encourage other people to take the law into their own hands as he (Mr. Smith) had done in this case. His Lordship had carefully considered the sentence he should pass upon him and he thought it must be one of imprisonment. There had been no evidence of a libel in that Court within the last few years, and therefore it was not necessary for him to go so far as the law allowed. The sentence of the Court would be that he (Mr. Smith) would be imprisoned for two months, and so far as his Lordship had any voice in the matter would be treated as a first offence. He would not, however, ship said he might have given him a longer sentence, but thought the one given would be sufficient. He had taken into consideration the season of the year.

Mr. Francis said he supposed it was unnecessary to say anything about costs. The Court said costs were provided for in 6 and 7 Victoria.

IN ORIGINAL JURISDICTION.

(Before Sir G. Phillips, Chief Justice.)

Thursday, July 27.

SAYLE AND CO. V. W. G. HUMPHREYS. The Attorney General (the Hon. E. L. O'Malley), instructed by Messrs Brereton and Watson, appeared for the plaintiff, and Messrs Frickel and McKee, instructed by Messrs Stephens and Holmes, represented the defendant.

The following gentlemen were empanelled as a jury: Messrs J. E. Squire, W. H. Smith, C. C. Coleman, M. C. Rozario, W. H. D. Dwyer, T. Jackson, and J. K. Davis. The Attorney General called the plaintiff, Robert Sayle, and the defendant, William G. Humphreys, who were engaged in the plaintiff's employ in the year 1874. The defendant was engaged in England, and at the time of his departure he entered into an agreement with the partners of the firm of Messrs Sayle & Co., an agreement which the Attorney General believed was a very ordinary kind of agreement for parties to enter into under similar circumstances. The Attorney General then read the plaintiff's petition, which set forth that a memorandum was made between the plaintiff and the defendant on the 10th March 1870, in which the defendant agreed to enter the plaintiff's service as clerk in Hongkong for four years, and also agreeing amongst other things, that he would not enter, in any capacity, into any kind of business, or trade, or to be carried on by the plaintiff, or Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having the consent of the plaintiff in writing. In case of the defendant being so engaged, whether as principal partner or otherwise, the sum of £1,000 at the commencement would be paid as a penalty in addition to the annual sum of £100. The defendant remained in the employ of the plaintiff until the 5th May 1874, when he left. Subsequently in 1881, he was engaged in Hongkong and Shanghai or within five miles thereof, or carry on that class of business on his own account or in partnership with others, within fourteen years after the expiration of the term of service agreed upon, without first having

Merchant Vessels in Hongkong Harbour.

Exclusive of late Arrivals and Departures reported to-day.

CANTON									
Ningpo	Cass	Brit. str.	761	July 27	Siemens & Co.	Shanghai			
Tso-Nan	Crocod	Chi. str.	1261	July 27	C. M. S. N. Co.	Shanghai			

HONGKONG, MACAO AND CANTON RIVER STEAMERS.	CHINESE GUN-VESSELS IN CANTON WATERS, &c.
---	--